DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 460 FL 009 340

AUTHOR Bruck, Margaret
TITLE The Suitability of Early French Immersion Programs for the Language Disabled Child.
SPONS AGENCY Department of the Secretary of State, Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE Jan 78
NOTE 87p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; Child Language; Early Childhood Education; Elementary School Students; English; French; *Immersion Programs; Language Ability; *Language Development; *Language Handicapped; Language Handicaps; *Language Instruction; Language of Instruction; Language Programs; *Language Research; Language Skills; Primary Education; Reading Development; Remedial Instruction; Remedial Programs; Retarded Speech Development; *Second Language Learning; Speech Communication; Verbal Development; Vocabulary Development

ABSTRACT

This is the second report of a longitudinal project, initiated in 1970, in which children with and without language problems are identified in French immersion and English kindergartens and closely monitored to the end of grade 3. This study investigates the desirability of early French immersion program for English-speaking children with language learning disabilities. The primary focus of the research is to determine whether these children should be left in the French immersion program or be transferred to an all-English program. The four groups selected for study comprise children with language disabilities in French immersion programs (FP) and in English classes (EP), children with normal language development in French immersion programs (FC) and in English classes (EC). A comparison of the performance of the FP children on a number of academic, cognitive and linguistic tests to that of the EP children and to the two normal control groups indicates that the FP children acquire the basics of their native language, learn the fundamental aspects of reading, spelling and math, and acquire proficiency in their second language. The results are discussed in terms of not switching children with problems out of immersion programs, but rather of providing them with appropriate remedial services in the program. Statistical data and a copy of the screening test and the teacher rating scale are provided. (Author/AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED153460

JAN. 1978

Les programmes d'immersion françaises à l'école primaire sont-ils appropriés pour l'enfant ayant des difficultés de langage?

Margaret Bruck
McGill-M.C.H. Centre d'Apprentissage

Des enfants qui éprouvent des difficultés de langage et qui se trouvent dans des maternelles d'immersion française sont évalués tous les ans, jusqu'à la fin de leur troisième année, afin de déterminer si ces programmes sont appropriés.

Leurs résultats de plusieurs épreuves académiques, cognitives, et linguistiques sont comparés à ceux d'un groupe d'enfants dans des programmes anglais qui ont aussi des difficultés de langage, ainsi qu'à deux groupes contrôles d'enfants normaux. Ces comparaisons indiquèrent que ces enfants acquièrent les bases de leur langue maternelle apprennent les aspects fondementaux de la lecture, de l'orthographe et des mathématiques, en plus de réussir dans la langue seconde.

Les données sont interprétées du point de vue de ne pas retirer ces enfants des programmes d'immersion mais plutôt de leur fournir une aide appropriée en rééducation.

FL009340

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaret Bruck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM.

The Suitability of Early French Immersion Programs for the Language Disabled Child

Margaret Bruck
McGill-M.C.H. Learning Center

Children with language disabilities in French immersion kindergartens are evaluated on a yearly basis until the end of grade 3 to determine the suitability of these programs for the child with problems. A comparison of their performance on a number of academic, cognitive, and linguistic tests to that of a group of language disabled children in English programs, and to two normal control groups, indicated that these children acquire the basics of their native language, learn the fundamental aspects of reading, spelling and math, as well as acquire proficiency in their second language. The results are discussed in terms of not switching children with problems out of immersion programs, but rather providing them with appropriate remedial services in the program.

Since the introduction of early French immersion programs there have been a considerable number of evaluations documenting the progress and development of participating students (see Swain & Bruck, 1976 for a review). Results of numerous studies show that these children become proficient in the reading, writing and speaking of French without any loss of competence in their first language. Furthermore they progress normally in cognitive and academic areas.

In most of these evaluations, the subjects were of average intelligence, had no particular problems and were from English-speaking middle class backgrounds. As a result, one cannot make any firm statements about the suitability of these programs for children not sharing these characteristics (e.g., children of low intelligence, children from working class homes, children from minority groups and children with language disabilities). In a review of the few studies evaluating the suitability of French immersion programs for these different subgroups, Genesee (1976) concluded that the available data were at best preliminary and urged further research into these areas.

The present study investigates the desirability of early French immersion programs for children with language learning disabilities. A child with a language disability is one who in spite of physical well being, normal intelligence, and a healthy personality acquires language with painful slowness. The language disabled child is relatively late in using words, combining them, and in developing clear articulation and syntactic sophistication. He has problems in comprehending as well as producing speech. At school age, he (she) lacks the facility in oral language and often misses the point of instructions, explanations, and informal conversations. A language disability is usually sufficient cause for school difficulty (cf. Golick, 1977; Ingram, 1975; Morehead & Ingram, 1973).

This research project was initiated because of the very practical concerns of educational therapists regarding the best academic course for children with learning problems who are in French immersion programs. The primary question was whether these children should be left in the French immersion program or be transferred to an all English program. There were two differing points of view. One group claimed that children with problems should be switched out of French immersion. It was argued that French immersion either

caused or contributed to these problems (e.g., see Trites, 1975). Thus, once in an English program, the children would have a much easier time and these problems would dissipate or disappear entirely. It was also felt that the children would be under much less pressure in the English stream and as a result life would be smoother psychologically.

Conversely, there were those who claimed that children with problems should stay in French immersion programs. It was argued that these children, if switched, would have exactly the same problems in an English stream and thus switching would be ineffective. Furthermore it was argued that "switching" would be detrimental to the child's self-esteem: he would be marked as not succeeding, he would be separated from his friends, and have to readjust to a new social-educational system. Lastly it was felt that the French immersion program was an appropriate environment in which these children could learn French. It has been noted that children with learning problems have persistent difficulties in terms of FSL programs (French as a second language - typically given for 20-40 minutes several times a week.) The nature of the teaching method appears to exploit their areas of weakness (a great deal of memory

work, repetition of language out of context and the learning of abstract rules). The children with learning problems who were in French immersion at least seemed to have some knowledge of their second language. Of special importance in the Quebec situation is the fact that knowledge of French is economically and socially necessary. Thus removing the problem child from French immersion classes might also decrease his chances for future survival in the province.

The study was designed to address these issues. This is the second report of a longitudinal project initiated in 1970 in which children with and without language problems are identified in French immersion and English kindergartens and then, closely monitored to the end of their grade 3 year. In the first report (Bruck, Rabinovitch & Oates, 1975) we concluded that by the end of grade 1 the problem children in French immersion classrooms were not encountering any more difficulties than they would had they been placed in an English classroom. We felt that the children were having a more difficult time from the end of grade 1 through some of grade 2 (possibly due to the introduction of English reading), but by grade 3, school had become easier and the children with problems were faring well.

However, the sample sizes on which these results were based were extremely small, and the conclusions were stated tentatively. In the present report the sample size has been increased and more definite conclusions can be drawn about the feasibility of French immersion programs for the language disabled child.

METHOD

Experimental Design

In order to determine the feasibility of French immersion programs for children with language learning disabilities, four different groups of children are selected in kindergarten and then followed on a yearly basis until grade 3. The four groups are:

1. Children with language disabilities in French immersion programs (French problem - FP)
2. Children with language disabilities who are in English classes. (English problem - EP). A comparison of this group's progress with the FP group's progress will indicate the specific effects of French immersion education on children with language disabilities.

3. A group of children with normal language development who are in French immersion programs (French control - FC). The performance of this group will provide a basis by which to evaluate the differential effects of French immersion education on children with language disabilities and children with normal language development.

4. A group of children with normal language development who are in traditional English classes (English control - EC). When this group's progress is compared to the EP group, the results will indicate how children with language difficulties are doing in regular English classes. Discrepancies between normal and problem children's performance in English classes must be compared to discrepancies between normal and problem children's performance in immersion programs, in order to account for any specific effects of French immersion programs.

The progress of all these children is then monitored in the following areas from the middle of kindergarten until the end of grade 3: first and second language skills, cognitive development and school achievement. Teachers

evaluations on individual students are obtained at the end of each school year. Grade 3 has been selected as a cut-off because by this time children should have acquired basic skills in reading, writing, spelling and math. One would expect that if any problems were to appear, that they would become apparent by this level.

These procedures are now presented in greater detail.

Subjects

In October of each school year, kindergarten children attending 24 classes (14 French immersion classes, 10 English classes) in 7 different schools, are screened for language disabilities. The teacher is first asked to make a list of all children from English speaking backgrounds whom they feel have problems with language*. Next, these children are interviewed individually and then given a diagnostic screening test. The test includes an object manipulation test, a story-retelling test, a sentence imitation test and an echolalia test for a total of 59 items. (see Appendix A) The test takes about 15 minutes to administer to each child. It was constructed so that

* Teachers are given some guidelines such as the child may rarely speak, he is difficult to understand, his grammar seems poor, he doesn't follow directions.

children with normal language development would have little difficulty on the test, whereas children with language disabilities would do poorly. In order to be classified as a problem child the following criteria were met:

1. The teacher felt the child had a language problem.
2. From the interview the experimenter, a specialist in child language, felt the child had a language problem.
3. On the screening test, he had to have a score lower than 35.
4. The child must have normal intelligence. All project children were given the Wechsler Preschool Primary Scale of Intelligence (see below). Any child not scoring above 85 on either the Verbal Scale or Performance Scale was eliminated from the project.

After the problem children were identified each was matched with a control child on the basis of sex, age in months, classroom teacher, and father's occupation. In addition each control satisfied the following criteria:

1. The teacher indicated that the control child's language seemed normal.

2. The experimenter, on the basis of the interview felt the child's language was normal.
3. On the diagnostic screening test, the children had to score over 50.
4. The child had normal intelligence. (see above)

Because the incidence of language learning disabilities is low, not enough children can be found in one year to complete the subject selection procedure for this project. Also because of attrition (children moving from the community; switching from French to English classes) the sample has to be continually replenished. In fact subjects have been screened in kindergarten every year from 1970 to 1976.

Table 1 presents data on the number of children who have been screened and tested in kindergarten, and retested in grade 1, grade 2 and grade 3. The sample sizes differ in

---

Table 1 About Here

---

every column becoming progressively smaller. This is because children have either moved, or switched into an English program (at which point they are dropped from the

study), or have not yet reached the grade for testing. For example there are 24 children who were screened and tested in kindergarten of 1977 and will not be tested until January of 1978. At that time the grade 1 figures will increase. This is true for every grade level. By June of 1980 all project subjects will have reached grade 3 at which time the study will be completed. Table 2 presents the kindergarten screening test scores for the children tested in kindergarten and grade 1. *

Table 2 About Here

A 2 x 2 ANOVA (the independent variables were problem vs. control; French immersion vs. English) was run on these data. There was a significant problem-control effect ($F(1, 91) = 269.54, p < .0001$)

Tests: English Testing

The children are given a range of tests in the winter of each school year to assess English language skills, academic achievement in English, and cognitive functioning.

---

* Because only children who are tested in kindergarten and in grade 1 are considered as subjects for this project, only their screening scores are presented.

Except for the math tests all testing is done on an individual basis. The following were given at each grade level.

In kindergarten the children are administered:

1. WPPSI: Full Scale Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence;
2. PPVT: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Form A;
3. NSST: Northwestern Syntax Screening Test;
4. ITPA: Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities - Selected Subtests
   - Auditory Reception
   - Visual Reception
   - Visual Sequential Memory
   - Auditory Association
   - Auditory Sequential Memory
   - Visual Association
   - Grammatic Closure
5. Golick Sentence Imitation Test (1977)

In grade 1 they receive:

1. PPVT Form B
2. NSST
3. Golick Sentence Imitation;
4. WISC Vocabulary: subtest from the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children
5. Similarities subtest from the WISC;
6. ITPA: 7 subtests given in kindergarten plus Auditory Closure and Sound Blending;

7. Metropolitan Math Test: subtest of Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary Battery I.

In grade 2 the children are given:

1. PPVT Form A
2. NSST
3. Golick Sentence Imitation Test
4. WISC Vocabulary
5. WISC Similarities
6. ITPA: 9 subtests given in Grade 1
7. Math subtest of Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary Battery II
8. WRAT: the three subtests of Reading, Math and Spelling from the Wide Range Achievement Test
9. Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales.

In grade 3 they are given:

1. PPVT Form B
2. Golick Sentence Imitation Test
3. Full Scale WISC
4. ITPA: 9 subtests
5. Math Computation and Problem subtests of the Metropolitan Achievement Test Elementary Battery
6. WRAT (3 subtests)
7. Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales.

To obtain additional information on the students' English academic and language skills, the grades 1, 2 and 3 teachers were asked to evaluate the students on a number of scales. Specifically, the grades 1, 2 and 3 English teachers of the EC and EP subjects are asked to evaluate these students' performance in reading, writing, math, oral and receptive language. Similarly the grade 2 and grade 3 English teachers of the FP and FC subjects are asked to evaluate their performance in reading, writing, oral and receptive language skills. (see Appendix B)

Tests: French Testing

French language skills are assessed in June of grades 1, 2 and 3 by the following means.

Teacher Ratings or Interviews. French immersion teachers are asked to rate each FP and FC child's level in reading, writing, math, expressive language, receptive language. (see Appendix B)

O.I.S.E. French Listening Comprehension Test Level 1. All children in the English and French groups are given this test.

Pilot Battery to assess French Language Basic Skills. One of the components of the present study is to develop a battery of tests which can be used to assess and diagnose

children with problems in French immersion. A number of tests are being developed to assess reading and writing skills of French immersion children in grades 1, 2 and 3. These tests are given individually in June of each year. The results of these tests will not be presented in this report.

RESULTS

English Language Skills, Cognitive Functioning, English Academic Achievement.

These results are presented in 3 sections:

1. the progress of children from kindergarten to grade 1.
2. the progress of the children through to grade 2.
3. the progress of the children through to grade 3.

Because of the number of tests given, they are grouped and discussed under the following categories:

1. Intellectual Functioning
2. Abstract Reasoning Skills
3. Grammatical Skills
4. Visual Skills
5. Auditory Skills
6. Math, Reading and Spelling Skills

The teacher interview data will be used to supplement the test results.

Three way analyses of variance with repeated measures, were run on each of the dependent variables discussed above

(except for the teacher interviews). The independent variables were: language ability (problem vs. control), language of instruction (French vs. English), and grade of testing. For the grade 1 analysis grade of testing had two levels - kindergarten and grade 1; at grade 2 there were three levels - kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2; at grade 3 there were four levels, kindergarten, grade 1, grade 2 and grade 3.* Because the same children are being retested at each grade level, this is the variable with repeated measures.

In order to simplify for the reader, the huge number of statistical analyses carried out, the following procedures will be followed:

1. Means will be reported for each test.
2. The only results discussed will be those where the statistical significance was at the .05 level or higher.
3. No F values, P values or degrees of freedom values will be listed.

---

* For those tests given only at one grade level (e.g. for the grade 1 analysis of the WPPSI, 2 subtests of the ITPA, Metropolitan Math), 2X2 analyses of variance were run. The independent variables were language ability and language of instruction.

4. A summary table of significant results will follow the presentation of the means of the variables.

Progress of Children from Kindergarten to Grade 1

This analysis focuses only on those children who were screened and tested in kindergarten and tested again in grade 1. There were:

23 children in the French Problem Group
27 children in the French Control Group
22 children in the English Problem Group
and 23 children in the English Control Group

Intellectual Functioning. Table 3 presents the WPPSI Verbal, Performance, and Full Scale scores of the children.

Table 3 about here

On all three scales, the control children obtained significantly higher scores than the language problem children. On the Performance and Full Scale scores there was also a significant language of instruction effect with the French immersion children performing better than the control children. On the Performance Scale there was a significant interaction which indicates that the discrepancy between the English and French Problem groups is greater than found between the two control groups.

This constellation of results suggests the following:

(1) In terms of <u>language ability</u>, the groups are well matched. The EP and FP groups have the same severity of disability.

(2) However, it appears that the EP group differs from the FP group in that their non-verbal abilities are poorer. The EP's lower Performance score also accounts for the two English groups' lower Full Scale score. It may be that there is a natural selection factor influencing which children go <u>and</u> stay in French immersion. If a child's language <u>or</u> non-verbal abilities are immature, he may be placed by parents and educators into a French immersion program, but if he has language and <u>other</u> problems he might be placed in an English class. While we must continually keep this in mind when interpreting our results, it should be noted that on most of the other measures to be reported, the EP group does not perform lower than the FP group at kindergarten. Thus the pattern of results just discussed may be unique to these tests.

(3) These averages indicate that despite their language learning difficulties, the children in the two problem groups have normal intelligence.

Vocabulary Skills. On the vocabulary subtests of the WISC (the WPPSI vocabulary subtest was used for the kindergarten measure) the PPVT, and the auditory reception test

---

Table 4 about here

---

of the ITPA (see Table 4), the control children performed better than the language problem children. On the auditory reception test there was a significant time of testing effect: the grade 1 scores were higher than the kindergarten scores. On the PPVT however, the opposite held: the kindergarten scores were higher than the grade 1 scores. As will be argued later, this seems to reflect a difference in Test Forms A and B, rather than a change in vocabulary ability.

The results of the vocabulary tests show that the FP children relative to their EP acemates were not suffering in terms of English vocabulary development by their participation in a French immersion program.

Abstract Reasoning Skills. On the similarities subtest of the WISC (the WPPSI was used as the kindergarten measure) and on the auditory association subtest of the ITPA, the

control groups performed better than the problem groups (see Table 5 for means). On the auditory association

---

Table 5 about here

---

test, the grade 1 scores were significantly higher than the kindergarten scores. There was also a significant language ability X time of testing interaction on the auditory association test indicating that the FP and EP groups improved more from kindergarten to grade 1 than the French and English control groups.

These results indicate that the abstract reasoning skills of the FP group were not impaired by participation in a French immersion program.

Grammatical Abilities. On the NSST receptive and productive subtests, the ITPA grammatic closure subtest and the sentence imitation test, the control children performed significantly better than the problem children and for all groups the grade 1 scores were better than the kindergarten scores (see Table 6).

Table 6 about here

On all tests, except for grammatic closure, there was a language ability X time of testing interaction which showed that the problem groups' performances improved to a greater degree than that of the control groups. In the case of the imitation test, this effect is explained by the fact that many of the control children are achieving such high scores in kindergarten that there was not much room for improvement (ceiling effect).

In addition to this interaction two additional significant interactions were found for the NSST production test: language ability X language of instruction and language of instruction X time of testing. When teased apart these effects seem to indicate that on the NSST production test, the EP group is the one that improves the most over the course of a year, and that the FC group improves the least.

Overall the results of the grammatical tests are most encouraging. In all cases we see the FP group improved its language skills at a rate commensurate with at least one of its control groups (EP, or FC).

Visual Skills. On the visual sequential memory, visual reception, and visual association subtests of the ITPA, the controls performed better than the problems, and all groups performed better in grade 1 than in kindergarten (see Table 7 for means). On the visual sequential memory test the

---

Table 7 about here

---

fact that the two problem groups improved from K to 1 while the control groups did not (a significant language ability X time of testing interaction) can be accounted for by the lack of progress of the EC group (a significant language ability X language of instruction X time of testing interaction).

These results once again show that there are no detrimental effects associated with having a language learning disability and being in a French immersion class.

Auditory Skills. On the auditory sequential memory test, the controls performed better than the problems, and scores were higher in grade 1 than in kindergarten (see Table 8 for means). The fact that the two problem groups

---

Table 8 about here

---

improved more than the controls (language ability X time of testing interaction) can be accounted for by the lack of progress by the EC group (language ability X language of instruction X time of testing interaction).

On the auditory closure and sound blending tests, the controls performed better than the problems. On the sound blending test the English groups performed better than the French groups. This effect is undoubtedly related to the fact that the EC and EP children were learning to read in English and were doing exercises in class which were very similar to the items found on this test. The FP and FC children, however, had not yet been introduced to English reading and, thus, did not perform as well.

In summary, while the French groups performed more poorly than the English groups on the sound blending test, on the other tests of auditory skills, the FP children

performed similarly to the EP children.

Math Skills. Raw, standard, grade level, and centile scores for the Metropolitan Achievement Test are presented in Table 9. The raw scores were used for the statistical

---

Table 9 about here

---

analysis. The controls performed better than the problems. As can be seen the two problem groups performed similarly. When the teachers were asked about the children's math skills at the end of grade 1, 25% of the FP group, 35% of the EP's, 22% of the EC's and 0% of the FC's were reported as having difficulty. Thus on the basis of a standardized test and teachers' reports, the FP group seem to be progressing in math at the expected rate even though it is taught in French.

Summary of K-1 Results. Referring to summary Table 10, we see no evidence to support the contention that children with language problems will do poorly in a French immersion program. These children improved at the same rate as their

---

Table 10 about here

---

controls on tests of English vocabulary, abstract reasoning skills, grammatical skills, visual skills, auditory skills and math skills.

One should also note that contrary to the WPPSI test results, none of the results of these tests suggests that the EP group was initially more disabled than the FP group.

Progress from Kindergarten to Grade 1 to Grade 2

In this section we will present the test results for all those children who have been tested in kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2. The kindergarten and grade 1 scores for those children who have not yet reached grade 2 or who have dropped out of the project after grade 1 were not included in these analyses. The number of children tested in each group are as follows:

FP = 15
EP = 20
FC = 25
EC = 22

Mean scores for the dependent variables are presented in Tables 11 (vocabulary skills), 12 (abstract reasoning skills), 13 (grammatical skills), 14 (visual skills),

15 (auditory skills) and 16 (academic achievement). The summary of the statistical analyses performed on these measures is presented in Table 17.

Tables 11-17 about here

While a detailed discussion of these results awaits the addition of children to the sample, several comments will now be made. On the English reading and spelling tests the English groups performed better than the French groups. This is to be expected and replicates results of many immersion studies (cf. Swain & Bruck, 1976 for review). The French groups had only recently been introduced to English reading and writing and need additional time before they perform similarly to their English-instructed peers. Notice, however, that the FP children were reading almost at grade level, while their spelling was further behind. In terms of the teachers' reports, equal numbers of FP and EP children were felt to be having particular difficulty in English reading.

On the math tests, the children also performed well despite the fact that they were receiving math instruction in a second language. The teachers reported that 53% of

the EP children and 40% of the FP children were having difficulty in math. Again these reports confirm the results of the standardized tests. Thus by the end of grade 2, we see that the FP children appear to be acquiring basic skills in English at an expected rate. We do not see in this report, as in the last, evidence that these children are having a particularly difficult time during this year.

The results of these analyses strongly suggest that children with language learning disabilities who attend French immersion programs from kindergarten until grade 2 progress and learn at the same rate (and sometimes even faster) than children with language problems who are instructed in their native language. On no test do the FP children lag behind.

Progress from Kindergarten to Grade 1 to Grade 2 to Grade 3

In this section the test results of children tested in kindergarten, grade 1, grade 2 and grade 3 will be reported. The number of subjects tested in each group was:

FP = 9
EP = 14
FC = 13
EC = 16

Intellectual Functioning. An analysis of variance comparing the kindergarten WPPSI scores

to the grade 3 WISC scores was run. The independent variables were language ability, language of instruction and time of testing. The means are presented in Table 18. On

---

Table 18 about here

---

all three scales, the control children performed significantly better than the problem group, and the grade 3 scores were higher than the kindergarten scores. On the Performance Scale, there was a significant language of instruction effect: the French groups had higher scores than the English groups. However, a significant language ability X language of instruction interaction on the Performance Scale indicates that this difference is attributable to the higher FP vs. EP scores.

The results of the I.Q. tests suggest the following:

1. Children with language problems in French immersion classes do not suffer impairment to verbal and non-verbal aspects of cognitive functioning due to this mode of education.
2. These results again remind us of the possibility that while the EP and FP groups may be well matched

on Verbal and Full Scale I.Q.'s, the EP group is more disabled in terms of non-verbal aspects of cognitive functioning.

Other skills tested in English. The mean scores for the other dependent variables are presented in Table 19 (vocabulary skills), Table 20 (abstract reasoning skills), Table 21 (grammatical skills), Table 22 (visual skills), Table 23 (auditory skills), Table 24 (academic skills). Statistical summaries of these results are presented in Table 25.

Tables 19-25 about here

By grade 3 the FP children performed as well or better than the EP children on all tests given. Their participation in French immersion programs does not appear to have been detrimental to their cognitive or linguistic development. They increased their performance on these tests at the expected rates. Furthermore, they have learned to read and spell in English: their grade 3 reading scores showed them to be reading as well as their EP controls (note that the lower scores associated with the French

groups in grade 2 were not found at grade 3 by which time the children had received sufficient English language arts instruction to read and spell like "typical" grade 3 students.) On two of the three math tests, the FP children performed similarly to the FC children)the EP group also performed similarly to the EC group). On the third test, which required reading a series of problems, the control children performed better; nevertheless the FP children were at the same level as the EP children. The teachers' evaluations of these children's reading, writing, math and English skills are consistent with the above findings. Overall they perceive the control children as having fewer problems than the problem children, and the FP and EP children as being on the same level on a variety of skills.

The above results are extremely encouraging for they suggest that children with language learning problems who attend French immersion programs can develop linguistic, cognitive, and academic skills at a similar rate to that which they would develop were they placed in an all English classroom. The additional benefits they enjoy by learning a second language will be discussed in the following section.

French Language Skills

Below we present the results of the O.I.S.E. French

listening comprehension test (Table 26) and of the teacher interviews. Because the listening comprehension test was not systematically given to all the children until June 1976, the data only represent the scores of a sub-sample of the population. Similarly the teacher interview forms were not developed and administered until June of 1975; thus, we do not have the teacher evaluation on all the children in the sample. Because of the nature of these data, no statistical analyses were run.

Referring to Table 26, we see that on a test of listening comprehension, the FP children perform quite well. Between grades 1 and 2 there is a big improvement for this

---

Table 26 about here

---

group who according to the norms are almost scoring at an average level for grade 2 immersion pupils. By grade 3 they perform similarly to the FC children. It is interesting to compare these developmental trends to those of the two English groups where there is little improvement from grade 1 to grade 3. The scores on this test certainly indicate that in terms of aural comprehension the FP children are acquiring proficiency in French.

In terms of teachers' reports of listening skills, we see that in grades 1 and 2 the teachers report that some of the FP children but none of the FC children have difficulty understanding what is said; however by grade 3 all children are considered able to understand almost all of what goes on in the classroom. There is a similar pattern for productive or expressive skills. At grade 1 many children are considered by their teachers unable to express themselves in French. This continues to improve until grade 3 when all teachers report that most of the time the FP children express themselves in French in a comprehensible manner.

The results of the O.I.S.E. Test and the teacher interviews both indicate that while it may take the FP group a little longer to learn the basics of a second language, by grade 3 they are becoming proficient in their second language. The fact that they have more difficulty expressing themselves than the FC children reflects the basic nature of their difficulty - language learning. Nevertheless they are learning not one but two languages at an admirable rate.

In terms of French reading ability at grade 1, 39% of the FP group as compared to 20% of the FC group were reported as having difficulty with reading. At grade 2 these figures are pretty much the same. By grade 3 the

number drops somewhat; two of the seven FP children rated were thought to be having problems and three of the 13 FC children were thought to be having problems. These figures are similar to what is happening to the EP and EC children in English reading.

These results don't present a picture of instant success for the FP children. But if they did it would be unexpected. These are children who do have problems. We didn't expect French immersion to solve these problems. What these results do show is that the children are no worse off than they would be in an English class and that they are learning to read French as well as to speak and understand it.

As was mentioned, one of the phenomena we have noticed in our clinical practice is that many language disabled children cannot cope with a typical second language program e.g. 40 minutes a day of French); they leave school with almost no knowledge of French. This may be due to the fact that most of these programs are based on teaching methods which inadvertently exploit the weaknesses of the learning disabled child. The French immersion program does not seem to have this effect; rather it provides a more suitable,

and natural, environment for these children to learn French. In order to live in Quebec society these children are going to have to become proficient in French. The French immersion program appears to be serving this function.

DISCUSSION

Results of the present study indicate that children with language disabilities can benefit from and learn in French immersion programs. Children should not be excluded from participating in these programs merely because it is felt that their first language development is poor. Our results show that these children can acquire some proficiency in the French language while continuing to develop skills in their own language. They also learn the basic concepts of reading, math and spelling even though these subjects are taught in French. It takes them longer than their normal controls to do this, but they do succeed without any special adjustments or help - a point to which we will return.

While encouraged by the above results, we are not blind to methodological problems of the study. It is highly possible that the two problem groups are not equated in terms of their severity of disability. The reason that the FP group may appear to fare so well is that they are

initially better off than their EP peers. While this assumption may prove valid, one factor may counteract this trend - the children in English classes with problems are receiving more special help and more appropriate special help for their problems than the children in the French immersion classes. Thus the French immersion children with problems are progressing despite the fact that they are not getting the same extra support that they would get were they in the English stream.

To document this,* at the Grade 1 level 24% of the English stream children received help either in the form of extra remedial reading, or attending a full time remedial class; 3% (2 out of 60) of the French immersion children received similar services. The general strategy for helping children with problems at this level is to have them repeat grade 1 (2 subjects did this) or switch them into the English stream. The two children who did receive help have done so in recent years. Hopefully this trend will continue.

At grade 2, 26% of the English stream children were receiving special services, and 23% of the French stream children were receiving special help. However, the English

* This information was supplied through the teacher interviews.

children were receiving more help in terms of time, and only 13% of the French immersion were receiving help in French. This is an important point, if the children are in French immersion, they must receive remedial services in French, not in English. Fortunately this trend is changing as it is the children just tested who are receiving the French remedial services.

The same trends exist at the grade 3 level: the same number of children in English and French streams are receiving remedial services with the French immersion children not being treated as intensively or consistently in terms of their problems as the English stream children.

The French immersion children are receiving help in English, for their problems in French because the services do not exist in French. If children are having difficulty in French they must be given help in French. Furthermore as was suggested in the last report it seems sensible that for those children who are a little slower acquiring basic skills in French immersion programs, that English reading not be introduced until they have a firmer grasp of these skills in French. It would make sense that this time, otherwise spent on English reading, be devoted to remediation in French skills.

From our experience over the past seven years, these trends are slowly changing. More special programs and classes are being arranged for the child with problems; teachers are voluntarily rearranging schedules so they can free extra time to work with individual children. But this will not be effective until all educators involved with French immersion programs are convinced that the child with problems has a place in rather than out of these classes. Hopefully the results of the present study have and will continue to clarify some of these issues.

FOOTNOTES

1. This project was funded by the Department of the Secretary of State under its programme to assist language research in Canada.

The author is grateful to Vivian Rabinovitch, Sandra Keller, Carol Bryce-Buchannan, Janet Tokefman, Raymonde Doyle and Françoise Lacoursière who helped with the testing through different parts of the project. I would like to thank Richard Tucker and Fred Genesee for their helpful comments on the manuscripts. Especial appreciation is extended to all principals and teachers in the South Shore Regional Protestant School Board for their patience and help during all aspects of the testing. Lastly, I am deeply indebted to Dr. Sam Rabinovitch who originally conceptualized the research problem, and who provided insight and encouragement during the project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bruck, M., Rabinovitch, M. S., & Oakes, M. The effect of French immersion programs on children with language disabilities - a preliminary report. Working Papers in Bilingualism, 1975, 5, 47-86.

Genesee, F. The suitability of immersion programs for all children. In M. Swain and M. Bruck (Eds.), Immersion education for the majority child, Canadian Modern Language Review, 1976, 32, 494-515.

Golick, M. Language disorders in children: a linguistic investigation. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, McGill University, 1977.

Ingram, T.T.S. Speech disorders in childhood. In E. Lenneberg and E. Lenneberg (Eds.), Foundations of Language Development Vol. 2, New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Morehead, D., and Ingram, D. The development of base syntax in normal and linguistically deviant children. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 1973, 16, 330-352.

Swain, M., and Bruck, M. (Eds.) Immersion for the majority child. Canadian Modern Language Review, 1976, 5.

Trites, R. L. Learning disabilities found in association with French immersion programs. Ottawa: The University of Ottawa Press, 1975.

TABLE 1

Number of Children Tested at Each Grade Level

Group	Kindergarten	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
FP	38	23	15	9
EP	34	22	20	14
FC	37	27	25	13
EC	29	23	22	16

TABLE 2

Kindergarten Screening Test Scores

Group	n	Score
FP	23	33.04
EP	22	30.60
FC	27	52.89
EC	23	53.95

TABLE 3

WPPSI Scores
(Kindergarten)

Group	Verbal	Performance	Full
FP	93	109	101
EP	91	96	93
FC	112	117	116
EC	111	114	114

TABLE 4

Vocabulary Skills (K→1)

Test	Group	Kindergarten	Grade 1
WISC/WPPSI	FP	9.00	8.26
Vocabulary: (Standard Scores)	EP	8.43	8.76
	FC	12.04	10.91
	EC	11.89	11.30
Peabody (I.Q. scores)	FP	97.83	94.23
	EP	94.95	87.43
	FC	112.41	109.33
	EC	108.91	107.22
Auditory Reception (Raw Scores)	FP	18.13	25.00
	EP	16.86	23.29
	FC	24.41	32.37
	EC	24.52	29.22

TABLE 5

Abstract Reasoning Skills (K→1)

Test	Group	K	1
Similarities (Standard Scores)	FP	9.52	10.96
	EP	9.57	9.48
	FC	12.78	13.85
	EC	13.09	13.04
Auditory Association (Raw Scores)	FP	15.13	21.39
	EP	14.67	21.15
	FC	24.52	28.15
	EC	23.96	27.87

TABLE 6

Grammatical Skills (K>1)

Test	Group	K	1
NSST reception	FP	26.30	30.00
	EP	25.14	30.48
	FC	31.81	34.22
	EC	31.43	32.78
NSST production	FP	24.48	29.00
	EP	20.48	28.90
	FC	30.85	34.30
	EC	31.48	36.09
Grammatic closure (Raw scores)	FP	12.74	16.39
	EP	10.71	16.52
	FC	20.30	23.63
	EC	23.00	24.96
Sentence Imitation (Errors)	FP	14.33	9.92
	EP	14.92	10.25
	FC	6.00	3.91
	EC	4.86	2.86

TABLE 7

Visual Skills (K→1)

Test	Group	K	1
Visual Sequential Memory (raw scores)	FP	17.96	20.70
	EP	14.52	19.57
	FC	18.74	21.52
	EC	19.65	19.52
Visual Reception (raw scores)	FP	15.78	21.65
	EP	15.95	22.24
	FC	19.79	25.11
	EC	20.30	23.35
Visual Association (raw scores)	FP	17.74	21.43
	EP	17.52	21.00
	FC	21.07	27.63
	EC	20.65	24.43

TABLE 8

Auditory Skills (K+1)

Test	Group	K	1
Auditory Sequential Memory (raw scores)	FP	15.04	18.87
	EP	14.00	19.48
	FC	24.22	28.22
	EC	27.48	27.91
Auditory Closure (raw scores)	FP	Not Given	13.04
	EP		14.32
	FC		18.63
	EC		17.57
Sound Blending (raw scores)	FP	Not Given	11.30
	EP		17.50
	FC		19.37
	EC		24.39

TABLE 9

Grade I Metropolitan Math Scores

Group	n	Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Grade Level	Centile
FP	20	40.95	42	1.7	45
EP	19	40.37	41	1.6	40
FC	21	46.05	45	1.8	60
EC	17	51.35	49	2.2	80

TABLE 10

Summary of K-1 Results: Significant Effects

Skill	Test	Language Ability	Language Instruction	Time of Testing	Interactions
Intellectual Functioning	WPPSI Verbal	Control higher			
	WPPSI Performance	Control higher	French higher		EP lower than FP
	WPPSI Full Scale	Control higher	French higher		
Vocabulary	WISC/WPPSI Vocabulary	Control higher			
	PPVT	Control higher		K higher	
	Auditory Reception	Control higher		I higher	
Abstract Reasoning	Similarities	Control higher			
	Auditory Association	Control higher		I higher	Problems increase more
Grammatical Abilities	NSST Reception	Control higher		I higher	Problems increase more
	NSST Production	Control higher		I higher	Problems increase more English increase more FP higher than EP, FC same as EC
	Grammatical Closure	control higher		I higher	
	Sentence Repetition	Control higher		I higher	Problems improve more

TABLE 10

(continued)

Visual skills	Visual Sequential Memory	control higher		I higher	problems increase more EC only group not to increase
	Visual reception	control higher		I higher	
	Visual association	control higher		I higher	
Auditory skills	Auditory Sequential Memory	control higher		I higher	problems increase more EC only group not to increase
	Auditory closure	control higher		-	
	Sound blending	control higher	English higher		
Math	Metropolitan	control higher			

TABLE 11

Vocabulary Skills (K-1-2)

Test	Group	K	1	2
WISC/WPPSI Vocabulary	FP	9.67	8.60	8.53
	EP	8.50	8.80	8.40
	FC	12.12	11.92	11.68
	EC	10.95	11.27	11.23
PPVT	FP	103.80	98.93	100.07
	EP	94.25	86.55	93.45
	FC	113.48	109.56	113.72
	EC	108.18	107.46	111.91
Auditory Reception	FP	19.20	27.53	26.67
	EP	17.00	22.85	30.30
	FC	24.00	32.20	35.20
	EC	24.73	29.59	36.05

TABLE 12

Abstract Reasoning Skills (K-1-2)

Test	Group	K	1	2
Similarities	FP	10.20	11.87	11.60
	EP	9.50	9.65	9.55
	FC	12.96	13.80	14.12
	EC	13.00	13.00	13.18
Auditory association	FP	16.67	22.47	25.93
	EP	14.60	21.00	25.15
	FC	24.72	28.20	30.80
	EC	24.09	28.09	31.32

TABLE 13

Grammatical Skills (K-1-2)

Test	Group	K	1	2
Reception NSST	FP	26.73	30.33	34.87
	EP	25.20	30.65	33.00
	FC	31.80	34.12	35.44
	EC	31.36	33.09	36.14
Production NSST	FP	25.27	30.33	33.07
	EP	20.30	28.75	32.10
	FC	31.68	34.48	36.80
	EC	31.41	36.00	36.91
Grammatic closure	FP	14.67	17.93	22.87
	EP	10.55	16.10	21.70
	FC	20.36	23.84	27.12
	EC	22.91	24.95	28.55
Sentence Imitation	(not enough subjects tested at Grade 2 level to do analysis)			

TABLE 14

Visual Skills (K-1-2)

Test	Group	K	1	2
Visual sequential memory	FP	17.07	21.20	22.53
	EP	14.35	19.65	19.85
	FC	18.60	21.80	22.80
	EC	19.36	19.41	22.45
Visual reception	FP	16.40	23.20	27.53
	EP	16.05	22.30	24.60
	FC	19.60	25.60	28.32
	EC	20.45	23.32	29.00
Visual association	FP	18.73	21.80	26.53
	EP	17.50	21.25	24.50
	FC	21.32	28.00	26.12
	EC	20.95	24.68	27.55

TABLE 15

Auditory Skills (K-1-2)

Test	Group	K	1	2
Auditory sequential memory	FP	15.00	18.60	21.80
	EP	14.25	19.65	22.65
	FC	24.48	28.80	31.72
	EC	27.45	27.91	31.77
Auditory closure	FP		13.40	18.13
	EP	Not	14.00	16.20
	FC	Given	19.00	21.00
	EC		17.64	20.95
Sound blending	FP		10.13	19.60
	EP	Not	17.20	24.90
	FC	Given	19.36	25.28
	EC		24.41	28.41

TABLE 16

Grade 2 Achievement Scores *

Tests	Groups	Raw Score	Standard Score	Grade Level Score	Centile
Metropolitan Math	FP	53.53	46	2.9	67
	EP	44.25	38	2.4	35
	FC	57.48	49	3.0	77
	EC	55.32	47	2.9	70
WRAT Math	FP	25.75		2.8	
	EP	24.75		2.6	
	FC	25.52		2.8	
	EC	25.82		2.8	
Spache Reading	FP			2.53	
	EP			3.00	
	FC			3.54	
	EC			4.57	
WRAT Reading	FP	39.47		2.1	
	EP	46.65		2.6	
	FC	48.36		2.7	
	EC	56.90		3.9	
WRAT Spelling	FP	25.87		1.8	
	EP	31.45		2.6	
	FC	29.52		2.5	
	EC	34.82		3.2	

* 2X2 ANOVA's were run on raw score data except for the Spache Reading where grade level scores were used.

TABLE 17

Statistical Summary of K-1-2 Analyses

Skill	Test	Language ability	Language instruction	Time	Interactions
Vocabulary	WISC subtest	controls higher	-		
	PPVT	controls higher	French higher	K,2 higher than I	
	Auditory reception	controls higher	-	K < 1 < 2	English higher than French at 2
Abstract reasoning	Similarities	controls higher	French higher	-	
	Auditory association	controls higher	-	K < 1 < 2	Problems increase more from K to 2 than controls
Grammatical skills	NSST reception	controls higher	-	K < 1 < 2	Problems more similar to controls at 2, than at k
	NSST production	controls higher	-	K < 1 < 2	- Difference between English K and French K disappears at 1 and 2 - FP higher than EP, FC and EC are the same - discrepancy between problems and controls less at 1 and 2 than at K
	Grammatic closure	controls higher	-	K < 1 < 2	- Problems increase more than controls - FP better than EP, EC better than FC

TABLE 17

(continued)

Visual skills	Visual sequential memory	controls higher	French higher	K < 1 < 2	
	Visual reception	controls higher	-	K < 1 < 2	
	Visual association	controls higher	-	K < 1 < 2	By Grade 2, problems similar to controls
Auditory skills	Auditory sequential memory	controls higher	-	K < 1 < 2	
	Auditory closure	controls higher	-	1 < 2	FP group increase the most from 1 to 2
	Sound blending	controls higher	English higher	1 < 2	Problems increase more than controls
Achievement skills	METROP. math	controls higher	French higher		
	WRAT math	-	-		
	Spache	controls higher	English higher	These tests only given in Grade 2	
	WRAT Read	controls higher	English higher		
	WRAT Spell	controls higher	English higher		

TABLE 18

I.Q. Scores at K and 3

Group	Verbal		Performance		Full	
	K	3	K	3	K	3
FP	98.44	103.33	110.56	117.22	104.67	110.78
EP	91.43	99.64	96.14	108.71	93.07	104.36
FC	111.77	112.15	113.38	119.85	113.85	117.46
EC	109.19	114.81	112.56	120.56	112.00	119.19

TABLE 19

Vocabulary Skills (K-1-2-3)

Test	Group	K	1	2	3
WISC Vocabulary	FP	9.22	8.56	8.56	10.00
	EP	8.71	9.07	8.86	9.79
	FC	12.15	11.54	11.54	11.69
	EC	10.69	10.87	11.50	12.19
PPVT	FP	108.89	99.00	100.67	92.56
	EP	98.64	86.71	96.00	89.86
	FC	113.77	108.08	115.39	108.54
	EC	107.13	106.06	110.81	108.63
Auditory Reception	FP	20.33	29.11	30.78	31.56
	EP	17.57	23.36	29.86	31.93
	FC	23.38	31.77	35.00	40.23
	EC	22.56	29.44	35.44	37.44

TABLE 20

Abstract Reasoning Skills (K-1-2-3)

Test	Group	K	1	2	3
Similarities	FP	10.00	11.56	11.22	13.33
	EP	9.64	9.93	9.86	12.36
	FC	12.69	13.46	13.85	14.38
	EC	12.94	12.44	12.69	14.75
	—	—	—	—	—
Auditory Association	FP	16.44	22.56	25.33	28.00
	EP	15.43	21.71	25.71	27.93
	FC	25.00	28.00	31.23	32.08
	EC	21.44	28.13	31.69	32.88

TABLE 21

Grammatical Skills (K-1-2-3)

Test	Group	K	1	2	3
Grammatic Closure	FP	14.89	17.33	23.22	26.00
	EP	10.86	16.43	22.29	24.07
	FC	20.69	24.15	27.54	29.00
	EC	20.19	24,38	28.50	30.25
	—	—	—	—	—
Sentence Imitation	FP				5.00
	EP				5.00
	FC		Analysis on Grade 3 scores only		.77
	EC				.88

TABLE 22

Visual Skills (K-1-2-3)

Test	Group	K	1	2	3
Visual sequential mamory	FP	17.22	22.22	25.00	25.44
	EP	15.14	19.14	19.86	20.50
	FC	17.77	23.15	22.23	24.08
	EC	17.00	19.63	23.19	23.38
Visual reception	FP	17.33	24.56	27.33	29.44
	EP	17.50	22.21	24.79	26.93
	FC	19.38	26.23	27.92	30.08
	EC	18.63	22.63	28.69	28.88
Visual association	FP	17.56	23.00	27.00	19.38
	EP	18.86	21.07	26.00	24.75
	FC	21.69	29.15	26.31	28.19
	EC	19.38	24.75	28.19	31.38

TABLE 23

Auditory Skills

Test	Group	K	1	2	3
Auditory sequential memory	FP	13.44	18.11	21.78	25.11
	EP	15.43	20.57	23.71	24.93
	FC	25.08	30.31	33.00	35.77
	EC	26.63	28.75	32.06	36.75
Auditory closure	FP	Not Given	14.22	19.00	20.11
	EP		13.71	17.50	20.07
	FC		18.46	21.85	22.77
	EC		17.13	21.25	22.94
Sound blending	FP	Not Given	8.89	20.56	20.56
	EP		14.43	27.43	23.79
	FC		16.00	25.38	28.62
	EC		24.00	28.88	29.44

TABLE 24

Achievement Test Scores Grade 3 Analysis*

		Grade Two				Grade Three			
Test	Group	Raw	Standard	Grade	Centile	Raw	Standard	Grade	Centile
Math Metropolitan Computation	FP					21.44	42	3.7	50
	EP					18.14	39	3.5	35
	FC					22.54	44	3.8	60
	EC					23.63	44	3.8	60
Math Metropolitan Problems	FP					13.78	45	3.6	50
	EP					8.64	39	3.0	25
	FC					18.38	49	4.0	65
	EC					15.11	46	3.7	55
Math WRAT	FP	25.44		2.6		28.77		3.6	
	EP	25.14		2.6		27.50		3.2	
	FC	25.31		2.6		29.69		3.9	
	EC	25.63		2.8		30.06		3.9	
Reading Spache	FP			2.61				4.38	
	EP			3.27				4.28	
	FC			3.70				4.81	
	EC			4.57				5.65	
Reading WRAT	FP	39.67		2.1		57.56		4.1	
	EP	48.50		2.8		57.86		4.1	
	FC	48.31		2.7		62.08		4.7	
	EC	58.00		4.1		65.06		5.1	
Spelling WRAT	FP	26.00		1.8		33.22		2.9	
	EP	32.00		2.7		36.36		3.5	
	FC	29.69		2.5		38.46		3.9	
	EC	34.69		3.2		39.44		4.2	

* Raw scores were used for the Metropolitan and WRAT analyses. Grade levels were used for the Spache Analysis.

TABLE 25

Statistical Summary of K-1-2-3 Analysis

Ability	Test	Language Ability	Language Instruction	Time of Testing	Interactions
Intellectual Functioning	Full Scale	Controls higher		K<3	
	Verbal	Controls higher		K<3	
	Perform-ance	Controls higher		K<3	FP vs. EP discrepency greater than FC vs. EC discrepency.
Vocabulary	WISC	Controls higher		K=1=2<3	
	PPVT	Controls higher	French higher	K=2>1=3	Problems decrease from K to 3, controls remain the same.
	Auditory Reception	Controls higher		K<1<2<3	
Abstract Reasoning	Similarities	Controls higher		K=1=2<3	
	Auditory Association	Controls higher		K<1<2<3	
Grammatical	Grammatic closure	Controls higher		K<1<2=3	Problems increase more
Visual	Visual Sequential		French higher	K<1<2<3	
	Visual Reception			K<1<2<3	
	Visual Association	Controls higher		K<1<2<3	By grade 3, EP lowest and FP same as FC, EC

TABLE 25

(continued)

Auditory	Auditory sequential memory	Controls higher		K<1<2<3	
	Auditory closure	Controls higher		K<1<2<3	
	Sound Blending	Controls higher	English higher	1<2=3	Between Grades 2 and 3, the problems decrease and controls increase. Between Grades 2 and 3, French increase, English don't
Achievement	METROP. Math Comput.			Analysis only for Grade 3 level	
	METROP. Math problems	Controls higher	French higher		
	WRAT Math			2<3	Bigger increase for controls than problems
	SPACHE Reading	Controls higher		2<3	
	WRAT Reading	Controls higher		2<3	French increase more than English
	WRAT Spelling	Controls higher		2<3	Bigger increase for French group who start later

*It appears that this difference is due to the form of the test used: Form A was used in K and Grade 2, while Form B was used in Grades 1 and 3.

TABLE 26

O.I.S.E. Listening Comprehension Test Scores

Group	Grade I	Grade II	Grade III
FP	20.1 (n = 11)	32.3 (n = 9)	38.1 (n = 6)
FC	28.5 (n = 10)	36.06 (n = 17)	38 (n = 9)
EP	10.1 (n = 11)	8.2 (n = 15)	10.75 (n = 8)
EC	9.6 (n = 7)	10.7 (n = 15)	14.25 (n = 8)

APPENDIX I

SCREENING TEST

Object Manipulation

Put the box under the table. (toy box)
(taking toys out)
Put the man in front of the boy.
Put the car behind the truck.
Put the ball in the cup.
Make the car push the truck. (show accident with car and truck)
Show me the one that was hit (truck).
Show me the boy's daddy.
Before you give me the people, put the cars in the box.
Give me three people.
Give me two pieces of furniture.

Story Telling	Child's Sequence
A little boy found a new wagon under the Christmas tree.	_____
It was red and white.	_____
He took it outside where he could play with it.	_____
His friends came to play with him.	_____
He gave his friend a ride.	_____
Now I will put my wagon back where I found it.	_____
So he put it _____	_____

Sentence Imitation

My house
I like dogs
John has a hat
The boy flies a kite
Mary and Pete climbed the tree
The children like to play with toys
They have some nice toys
The girl took Mark's bisycle
Mummy is not home yet
The bear was being chased
Do you like eating lollipops?
The children are not going to school
We play with the big red blocks
The man was hit by the car
The boy is pulling the girl's hair
Are you going to read a story?

Slingerland Echolalia

animals	elephant	basket	magazine	metal	vegetable
mother	refrigerate	enemy	hospital	spaghetti	grandfather
visited	aluminum	log cabin	dominoes	caterpillar	temperature

river roads
eating spaghetti and vegetables
family and friends
sheets and pillow cases
hungry and thirsty
trick or treat games

Teacher's Rating Sclae

Name of student

Grade

Date

Teacher's name

Reading Skills

1. Please check the appropriate description for this child from the labels below.

   - Excellent (top of the class)
   - Very good (top third)
   - Average for grade level
   - Weak (quite below grade level)
   - Very poor (can read just a few words)
   - Non-reader

   Comments:

2. Does the child have specific reading problems in

   - decoding
   - comprehension
   - both

   Comments:

3. Is he receiving remedial help in reading? If so please give details.

4. If he is not receiving extra help do you think he should be?

Written Work:

5. How would you describe this child's written work

   - Excellent (top of the class)
   - Very good (top third)
   - Average for grade level
   - Weak (quite below grade level)
   - Very poor
   - Never produces written work

6. If the child's work is poor is it because of:

   - Handwriting
   - Spelling
   - Punctuation
   - Other

Comments:

Mathematics

7. How would you describe the child's work in mathematics.

   - Excellent (top of the class)
   - Very good (top third)
   - Average for grade
   - Weak
   - Very poor

8. If he does poorly is it because

   - he cannot do the computations
   - he cannot read the problem
   - he can read the problem but does not know how to figure it out
   - he cannot read the problems but if they are read to him he can figure it out.

Other comments:

Language Skills

9. How much do you think the child understands what you say to him in English?

   - Everything
   - Mostly everything
   - A fair amount
   - Not very much
   - Nothing

Comments:

10. Compared to other children in the class how well does he communicate in English?

- Excellent
- Above average
- Average
- Weak
- Poor

11. If he has difficulties in communicating are they due to

1) Vocabulary
2) Grammar (sentence structure)
3) Pronunciation

Comments:

12. Is the child a behavioral problem in school? If so please give details.

13. Does the child have friends?

Nom de l'élève:

Niveau scolaire:

Date:

Nom de l'enseignant:

Lecture

(S.V.P. cochez (✓) là où la description correspond à vos observations de l'enfant.)

- Excellente (en tête de la classe)
- Très bonne (1er tiers de la classe)
- Moyenne (à son niveau scolaire)
- Fautive (en dessous de la moyenne de sa classe)
- Très fautive (ne lit que quelques mots)
- Nulle (ne lit pas du tout)

Remarques:

2. Est-ce que l'élève a des difficultés spécifiques:
   - à acquérir le mécanisme de la lecture;
   - à comprendre ce qu'il lit;
   - dans les deux tâches.

Remarques:

3. Est-ce que l'enfant reçoit une aide spéciale en lecture?

   Si oui, fournir les détails.

4. Si l'enfant n'est pas aidé de façon spéciale en lecture,

   estimez-vous qu'il devrait l'être?

Travaux écrits

5. Comment qualifieriez-vous le rendement de cet élève?

   - Excellent (en tête de la classe)
   - Très bon (1er tiers de la classe)
   - Moyen (à son niveau scolaire)
   - Faible (plutôt en dessous de la moyenne de sa classe)
   - Très faible
   - Nul (n'exécute aucun travaux écrits)

6. Si le rendement de l'élève est faible, croyez-vous que ce soit

   dû à des difficultés:

   - d'écriture
   - d'épellation
   - de ponctuation
   - autres

Remarques:

Mathématiques

7. Comment qualifieriez-vous le rendement de cet élève:

- Excellent (en tête de la classe)
- Très bon (1er tiers de la classe)
- Moyen (à son niveau scolaire)
- Faible (en dessous de la moyenne de sa classe)
- Très faible
- Nul

8. Si le rendement de l'élève est faible, croyez-vous que ce soit parce qu'il:

- ne sait pas faire les opérations;
- est incapable de lire les problèmes;
- peut lire les problèmes mais incapable de les solutionner;
- incapable de lire les problèmes mais peut les solutionner lorsqu'on les lui lit.

Autre remarques:

Langage oral:

9. Dans quelle mesure l'enfant comprend-il ce que vous lui dites en français:

- Tout
- A peu près tout

- En bonne partie
- Très peu
- Rien

Remarques:

10. En comparaison aux autres enfants de sa classe, dans quelle mesure peut-il s'exprimer en français?

-Très facilement
- Assez facilement (au dessus de la moyenne de sa classe)
- Passablement
- Difficilement
- Très difficilement

11. S'il a de la difficulté à s'exprimer, croyez-vous que ça puisse s'expliquer par des lacunes en:

- vocabulaire
- grammaire (structure de phrase, le genre, temps des verbes, etc.)
- prononciation

Remarques:

12. Est-ce que l'enfant présente des problèmes de comportement à l'école? Si oui, décrivez

13. A-t-il des amis?